



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,659	03/24/2004	Doo-Hoon Goo	8836-229 (IE12193US)	4316
22150	7590	09/11/2007		
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797			EXAMINER KIM, PETER B	
			ART UNIT 2851	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/11/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/807,659	Applicant(s) GOO ET AL.	
	Examiner Peter B. Kim	Art Unit 2851	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 31, 2007 has been entered, and fully considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 7-9, 17, 20-22, 25-27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura et al. (6,052,173) in view of Ohtsuki et al. (6,078,598) and Nishi et al. (2004/0223132).

Regarding claims 1, 3, 17 and 21, Miura et al. disclose "a light source device (fig. 1, LH1; Light source) for generating source light having a wavelength of about 315 nm to 400 nm (col. 6, line 54-58, where a lamp emits UV radiation, which encapsulates 315 nm to 400 nm);

an optical fiber cord (LF1; optical fiber) for guiding the source light generated from the light source device (LH1) into a light focusing device (LO1; exposure light exit part);

a lens (fig. 7a; L1 or L2) positioned in the light focusing device (LO1) to receive the source light from the optical fiber cord (LF1), the light focusing device (LO1) to focus the source light to the edge of a wafer (W; col. 6, lines 65-67 through col. 7, line 1; figure 7); and a wavelength corresponds to the highest absorptivity of a photoacid generator of resist coated on the wafer (col. 1, lines 42-4, where exposure light turns the resist).

Miura et al. does not disclose (claims 1 and 17) a light source with wavelength of 315 nm to about 400 nm and “a wavelength converter for converting the wavelength of the source light to wavelength of about 193 nm” and (claims 3 and 21) “wherein the wavelength converter is made of an optically non-linear material.”

However, Ohtsuki et al. teach a wavelength converter (2; optical element), which uses a non-linear optical crystal to convert light of wavelength 386 nm to a wavelength of 193 nm (col. 14, lines 23-25) utilized in an exposure apparatus. Nishi teaches in para 0176 that a wafer is exposed with light source of various wavelengths including a semiconductor laser in wavelength region or an ultraviolet light source (in the region of 193 nm) by converting the wavelength. Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Miura et al. by including a light source as disclosed by Nishi and a wavelength converter of an non-linear optical material as taught by Ohtsuki utilized in a manner described above for at least the purpose of reducing energy loss.

Regarding claims 2 and 20, Miura et al. further disclose “wherein the light source device includes a lamp, a parabolic or elliptical mirror, a plate, a shutter (SH1), and a filter (col. 6, lines 54-57).”

Art Unit: 2851

3. Regarding claims 7-8 and 25-26, Miura et al. further disclose (claims 7 and 25) “wherein the source light is i-line” and (claims 8 and 26) “is one of lights having a wavelength within the ultraviolet range (col. 6, lines 53-54, where the light source use is in the UV range emitting UV radiation).”

Regarding claims 4, 9, 22, and 27, Miura et al. as modified disclose an optically non-linear material, but does not disclose “wherein the optically non-linear material is one selected from the group consisting of beta barium borate (β -BaB₂O₄), lithium triborate (LiB₃O₅), cesium lithium borate (CsLiB₆O₁₀), potassium titanyl phosphate (KTiOPO₄), potassium titanyl arsenate (KTiOAsO₄), potassium dihydrogen phosphate (KH₂PO₄), deuterated ammonium dihydrogen phosphate (KD₂PO₄), ammonium dihydrogen phosphate (NH₄H₂PO₄), deuterated ammonium dihydrogen phosphate (ND₄H₂PO₄), rubidium dihydrogen phosphate (RbH₂PO₄), cesium dihydrogen arsenate (CsH₂AsO₄), deuterated cesium dihydrogen arsenate (CsH₂AsO₄), lithium niobate (LiNbO₃), lithium tantalate (LiTaO₃), lithium iodate (LiIO₃), potassium niobate (KNbO₃), barium nitrate (Ba(NO₃)₂), solid-state raman shifters (KGd(WO₄)₂), potassium pentaborate, 3-methyl-4-nitropyridine-1 oxide, L-arginine phosphate, and combinations thereof (col. 3, lines 2-4, where the wavelength converter can be formed of LiIO₃).”

However, Ohtsuki et al. teach a wavelength converter utilizing a BBO crystal (also referred to as β -BaB₂O₄; col. 14, lines 22-25) or a KTP crystal (also referred to as KTiOPO₄; col. 14, lines 41-43). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the non-linear material of Miura et al. as modified to have it made of at least β -BaB₂O₄, KTiOPO₄, or any of the aforementioned compounds for at least the purpose of reducing production cost.

Regarding claim 31, Miura et al. as modified disclose the limitations as set forth in claims 1 and 9

4. Claims 5 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura et al. in view of Ohtsuki et al. and Nishi et al. as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, and further in view of Tanaka et al. (5,811,211). The teachings of Miura et al. and Ohtshuki et al. have been discussed above.

Regarding claims 5 and 23, Miura et al. as modified disclose a resist, but does not disclose “wherein the resist is ArF resist.”

However, having “wherein the resist is ArF resist” is known to the art as it is evident by the teaching of Tanaka et al. (col. 19, lines 40-42, where the resist is associated with the laser’s wavelength). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the resist of Miura et al. as modified by having an ArF resist for at least the purpose of obtaining an image, since Miura et al. discloses a UV exposure source.

5. Claims 6, 10-14, 18-19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura et al. in view of Ohtsuki et al. and Nishi et al. as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, and further in view of Yamamoto et al. (4,905,037). The teachings of Miura et al. and Ohtshuki et al. have been discussed above.

Regarding claims 6 and 24, Miura et al. as modified discloses a lamp that emits UV radiation (col. 6, line 54), but does not disclose “wherein the lamp is a mercury arc lamp.”

However, Yamamoto et al. teach “wherein the lamp is a mercury arc lamp (col. 6, lines 50-51).” Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify lamp of Miura et al. as modified by having the lamp as a mercury arc lamp for at least the purpose of utilizing UV radiation and reducing production costs.

Regarding claims 10-14, 18-19 and 28, Miura et al. as modified disclose the claimed invention except for (claims 10 and 18-19) “wherein the wavelength converter is positioned in front of the lamp,” (claim 11) “wherein the wavelength converter is positioned between the optical fiber cord and the filter,” (claim 12) “wherein the wavelengths converter is positioned between the lens and the optical fiber cord,” (claim 13) “wherein the wavelength converter is installed at the end of the light-focusing device,” and (claims 14 and 28) “wherein the wavelength converter is attachable/removable).”

However, having the wavelength converter being attachable/removable to be placed in the specific aforementioned positions above is known to the art as it is evident by the teaching of Yamamoto et al. (see abstract, where the converter is disposed in a light path between a light source and a photosensitive medium. Further, figures 8-9, 17 and 22 correspond to similar positions for placing the wavelength converter in an image transfer system). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Miura et al. by having a wavelength converter attachable/removable to be positioned in a manner described above for at least the purpose reducing production costs.

Art Unit: 2851

6. Claims 15-16 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura et al. in view of Ohtsuki et al. and Nishi et al., as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, and further in view of Minemoto et al. (5,381,429).

Miura et al. as modified disclose a wavelength converter, but does not disclose (claim 15) “wherein an anti-reflective coating film (ARC) is coated on surface of the wavelength converter” and (claim 16) “wherein the anti-reflective coating film (ARC) is made of one selected from the group consisting of zirconia (ZrO_2), magnesia (MgO), silica (SiO_2), titania (TiO_2), and combinations thereof.”

However, having a wavelength converter with an anti-reflective coating consisting of one compound from above is known to the art as it is evident by the teaching of Minemoto et al. (col. 8, lines 4-9, where the anti-reflective coating of SiO_2 is applied to a wavelength converter). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the wavelength converter of Miura et al. as modified to include an anti-reflective coating and utilized in a manner described above for at least the purpose to transmit wavelengths of higher harmonics.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant’s argument regarding different types of light sources of Miura and Ohtsuki, the rejection is modified using Nishi et al. reference. Further regarding directly converting the wavelength, Nishi discloses that the wavelength of a semiconductor laser is converted into ultraviolet light using a nonlinear optical crystal, and Ohtsuki discloses directly converting from 386 nm into 193 nm, which is the direct converting step as claimed, as discussed by applicant in page 9 of the response.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter B. Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-2120. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diane Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2399. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Peter B. Kim
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2851

September 4, 2007